UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/639
31 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Agenda item 129

# FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE, THE UNITED NATIONS CONFIDENCE RESTORATION OPERATION IN CROATIA, THE UNITED NATIONS PREVENTIVE DEPLOYMENT FORCE AND THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE FORCES HEADQUARTERS

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Igor V. GOUMENNY (Ukraine)

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 20 September 1996, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided to include in the agenda of its fifty-first session the item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" and to allocate it to the Fifth Committee.

2. The Committee considered the item at its 14th and 17th meetings, on 25 and 31 October 1996. Statements and observations made in the course of the Committee's consideration of the item are reflected in the relevant summary records (A/C.5/51/SR.14 and 17).

3. For its consideration of the item, the Committee had before it the reports of the Secretary-General on the financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters (A/50/696/Add.4 and Corr.1 and A/50/696/Add.5-7) and the related reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/50/903/Add.1 and A/51/497).

## II. CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.5/51/L.7

4. At the 17th meeting, on 31 October, the representative of Armenia introduced a draft resolution entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" (A/C.5/51/L.7), submitted by the Chairman on the basis of informal consultations.

5. At the same meeting, the Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.7 without a vote (see para. 6).

## III. RECOMMENDATION OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

6. The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

### Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters

The General Assembly,

Having considered the reports of the Secretary-General on the financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces Headquarters 1/ and the related reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, 2/

Having considered also the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the review of the management structure in the civilian staff component of the United Nations Peace Forces, 3/

Recalling Security Council resolutions 727 (1992) of 8 January 1992 and 740 (1992) of 7 February 1992, in which the Council endorsed the sending of a group of military liaison officers to Yugoslavia to promote maintenance of the ceasefire,

Recalling also Security Council resolution 743 (1992) of 21 February 1992, by which the Council established the United Nations Protection Force, and the subsequent resolutions by which the Council extended and expanded its mandate,

---

1/ A/50/696/Add.4 and Corr.1 and A/50/696/Add.5-7.

2/ A/50/903/Add.1 and A/51/497.

3/ A/51/305.

Recalling further Security Council resolution 981 (1995) of 31 March 1995, by which the Council established the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, to be known as UNCRO,

Recalling Security Council resolution 983 (1995) of 31 March 1995, by which the Council decided that the United Nations Protection Force within the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia should be known as the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force,

Recalling also Security Council resolution 1025 (1995) of 30 November 1995, by which the Council decided to terminate the mandate of the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia on 15 January 1996,

Recalling further Security Council resolution 1031 (1995) of 15 December 1995, in which the Council decided to terminate the mandate of the United Nations Protection Force on the date on which the Secretary-General reported that the transfer of authority from the United Nations Protection Force to the Implementation Force had taken place,

Recalling the letter dated 1 February 1996 from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General informing him of the Council's concurrence in principle that the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force become an independent mission, 4/

Recalling also its resolution 46/233 of 19 March 1992 on the financing of the United Nations Protection Force and its subsequent resolutions and decisions thereon, the latest of which was decision 50/410 C of 17 September 1996,

Reaffirming that the costs of the combined Forces are expenses of the Organization to be borne by Member States in accordance with Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling its previous decisions regarding the fact that, in order to meet the expenditures caused by the combined Forces, a different procedure is required from the one applied to meet expenditures of the regular budget of the United Nations,

Taking into account the fact that the economically more developed countries are in a position to make relatively larger contributions and that the economically less developed countries have a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards such an operation,

Bearing in mind the special responsibilities of the States permanent members of the Security Council, as indicated in General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963, in the financing of such operations,

Noting with appreciation that voluntary contributions have been made to the combined Forces by certain Governments,

---

4/ See S/1996/76.

Mindful of the fact that it is essential to provide the combined Forces with the necessary financial resources to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council,

1. Takes note of the status of contributions to the combined Forces as at 23 October 1996, including the contributions unpaid in the amount of 731.8 million United States dollars, representing 16 per cent of the total assessed contributions from the inception of the United Nations Protection Force to the period ending 31 March 1996, notes that some 32 per cent of the Member States have paid their assessed contributions in full, and urges all other Member States concerned, in particular those in arrears, to ensure the payment of their outstanding assessed contributions;

2. Expresses concern about the financial situation with regard to peacekeeping activities, in particular as regards the reimbursement of troop contributors, which bear burdens owing to overdue payments by Member States of their assessments;

3. Expresses its appreciation to those Member States which have paid their assessed contributions in full;

4. Urges all other Member States to make every possible effort to ensure payment of their assessed contributions to the combined Forces in full and on time;

5. Endorses the observations and recommendations contained in the reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, 2/ subject to the provisions of the present resolution;

6. Endorses the recommendations made by the Office of Internal Oversight Services in its report on the review of the management structure in the civilian staff component of the United Nations Peace Forces, 3/ and requests the Secretary-General to ensure that those recommendations are fully taken into account in the future planning of United Nations peacekeeping missions;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to issue the performance report for the period from 1 January to 30 June 1996 no later than 8 December 1996;

8. Also requests the Secretary-General to include in his next report on the financing of the combined Forces updated information on the status of liquidation of the United Nations Protection Force and the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, including costs, staffing levels, a description of difficulties that have been encountered, the Secretary-General's assessment of the progress of liquidation and projections regarding its completion;

9. Expresses its concern about the payment by the combined Forces of charges for items that should have been provided without cost under the status-of-forces agreement;

10. Urges the Secretary-General to convey the concerns of the General Assembly to the Governments concerned, as well as the request by the Assembly

that the Governments reimburse the combined Forces for those expenditures, requests the Secretary-General to withhold settlement of claims submitted by the Governments concerned until the matter of the expenditures is resolved, and requests the Secretary-General to include information on efforts to obtain reimbursement in the next report on the financing of the combined Forces;

11. Reminds all Member States that are host to a United Nations peacekeeping mission of the importance of concluding a status-of-forces agreement with the United Nations when a mission has been authorized and of their obligation to comply fully with the terms of such agreements, when concluded;

12. Requests the Secretary-General to take all necessary action to ensure that the combined Forces are administered with a maximum of efficiency and economy;

13. Decides, as an ad hoc arrangement, to apportion the amount of 115,373,000 dollars gross (113,866,300 dollars net) already appropriated by the General Assembly in its resolution 50/235 of 7 June 1996 for the period from 1 to 31 December 1995 among Member States in accordance with the composition of groups set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Assembly resolution 43/232 of 1 March 1989, as adjusted by the Assembly in its resolutions 44/192 B of 21 December 1989, 45/269 of 27 August 1991, 46/198 A of 20 December 1991, 47/218 A of 23 December 1992, 49/249 A of 20 July 1995, 49/249 B of 14 September 1995 and 50/224 of 11 April 1996 and its decisions 48/472 A of 23 December 1993 and 50/451 B of 23 December 1995, and taking into account the scale of assessments for the year 1995 as set out in resolution 49/19 B of 23 December 1994 and decision 50/471 A of 22 December 1995;

14. Decides also that, in accordance with the provisions of its resolution 973 (X) of 15 December 1955, there shall be set off against the apportionment among Member States, as provided for in paragraph 13 above, their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund of the estimated staff assessment income of 1,506,700 dollars approved for the period from 1 to 31 December 1995;

15. Decides further that, for Member States that have fulfilled their financial obligations to the combined Forces, there shall be set off against the apportionment, as provided for in paragraph 13 above, their respective share in the amount of 115,373,000 dollars gross (113,866,300 dollars net) from the unencumbered balance of 227,406,878 dollars gross (227,911,279 dollars net) in respect of the period ending 31 December 1995;

16. Decides that, for Member States that have not fulfilled their obligations to the combined Forces, their share in the amount of 115,373,000 dollars gross (113,866,300 dollars net) from the unencumbered balance of 227,406,878 dollars gross (227,911,279 dollars net) for the period ending 31 December 1995 shall be set off against their outstanding obligations;

17. Decides to authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the liquidation of the combined Forces and the provision of common support for the period from 1 November to 31 December 1996 in the amount of 12,462,300 dollars gross (11,574,400 dollars net);

18. Invites voluntary contributions to the combined Forces in cash and in the form of services and supplies acceptable to the Secretary-General, to be administered, as appropriate, in accordance with the procedure established by the General Assembly in its resolutions 43/230 of 21 December 1988, 44/192 A of 21 December 1989 and 45/258 of 3 May 1991;

19. Decides to keep the agenda item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" under review during its fifty-first session.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/640
31 October 1996
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

Fifty-first session
Agenda items 129 and 140 (a)

# FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE, THE UNITED NATIONS CONFIDENCE RESTORATION OPERATION IN CROATIA, THE UNITED NATIONS PREVENTIVE DEPLOYMENT FORCE AND THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE FORCES HEADQUARTERS

# ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Igor V. GOUMENNY (Ukraine)

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 20 September 1996, the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided to include in the agenda of its fifty-first session the items entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" and "Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations" and to allocate them to the Fifth Committee.

2. The Fifth Committee considered the items at its 14th and 17th meetings, on 25 and 31 October 1996. Statements and observations made in the course of the Committee's consideration of the items are reflected in the relevant summary records (A/C.5/51/SR.14 and 17).

3. For its consideration of the items, the Committee had before it the report of the Secretary-General (A/51/389) and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/51/491).

96-29959 (E) 011196 021196

## II. CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.5/51/L.8

4. At the 17th meeting, on 31 October, the representative of Armenia introduced a draft resolution entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" and "Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations" (A/C.5/51/L.8), which had been submitted on the basis of informal consultations.

5. At the same meeting, the Fifth Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/51/L.8 without a vote (see para. 6).

## III. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE

6. The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft resolution:

### Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters

### Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

The General Assembly,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Financing of the United Nations Protection Force, the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia, the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force and the United Nations Peace Forces headquarters" and "Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations" 1/ and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, 2/

1. Endorses the observations and recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; 2/

2. Requests the Secretary-General to develop specific measures, including criteria and guidelines for implementing the principles outlined in his report and to report thereon to the General Assembly through the Advisory Committee.

---

1/ A/51/389.

2/ A/51/491.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/641
1 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Agenda item 110 (b)

HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

# Strengthening of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights/Centre for Human Rights

## Report of the Secretary-General

1. In its resolution 50/187 of 22 December 1995 on the strengthening of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights/Centre for Human Rights, the General Assembly, noting that in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, the World Conference on Human Rights stressed the importance of strengthening the Centre for Human Rights and taking into account the establishment of the post of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as the mandate for the post, including its coordinating role and its overall supervision of the Centre, as well as the request by the Assembly in its resolution 48/141 of 20 December 1993 for appropriate staff and resources to enable the High Commissioner to fulfil his mandate, requested the Secretary-General to make available additional human and financial resources, within the overall regular budget of the United Nations, to enhance the capability of the High Commissioner and of the Centre to fulfil effectively their respective mandates and also requested him to submit an interim report to the Commission on Human Rights at its fifty-second session and a final report to the Assembly at its fifty-first session on the implementation of the resolution. The present report is submitted pursuant to that request.

2. In connection with the establishment of the post of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights by the General Assembly in its resolution 48/141, the Secretary-General submitted a statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/48/61), indicating that, while the High Commissioner would draw on the resources of the Centre to fulfil his tasks, a number of additional posts (one Under-Secretary-General, two P-5 and three General Service posts) and

operational funds would be required, totalling $1,471,400. The Assembly did not approve those posts at its forty-eighth session, but authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments of up to $1,471,400 and in connection with the establishment of the office of the High Commissioner decided to consider such additional appropriation as might be necessary and not to exceed $1,471,400 at its resumed forty-eighth session. At that session, the Assembly decided to defer consideration of the question to its forty-ninth session. In his report to the Assembly at its forty-ninth session (A/C.5/49/53), the Secretary-General, on the basis of experience, proposed that instead of the six above-mentioned posts (one Under-Secretary-General, two P-5 and three General Service posts) nine posts be provided for the High Commissioner and his office (one Under-Secretary-General, two P-5, one P-4 and three General Service for Geneva and one D-1 and one General Service post for the New York Office). The Secretary-General indicated in that report that it was estimated that the revised requirements of the High Commissioner, as defined above, could be met from within the balance of the amount for which the Secretary-General was authorized to enter into commitment, that is, $1,471,400.

3. Regarding the implementation of the Vienna Declaration and the Programme of Action, endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 48/121, it will be recalled that in the related statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/48/46), the Secretary-General indicated that one P-5, one P-4 and two General Service posts would be required, as well as operational funds totalling $1,167,500. The Assembly did not approve those posts at its forty-eighth session, but authorized the Secretary-General to enter into all the commitments necessary within the above amount in respect of the full implementation of the activities envisaged in the resolution and to consider such additional appropriation as might be necessary and not to exceed $1,167,500 at its resumed forty-eighth session. At that session, the Assembly decided to defer consideration of the question to its forty-ninth session. In his report to the Assembly at its forty-ninth session (A/C.5/49/53), the Secretary-General requested the appropriation of the amount of $1,167,500.

4. Concerning the continuing United Nations human rights presence in Cambodia, the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session did not appropriate the additional resources of $1,834,100 requested by the Secretary-General in his report of 31 May 1994 (A/C.5/48/78). Instead, the Assembly took note of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions contained in its report (A/48/7/Add.12) and authorized the Secretary-General to enter into additional commitments up to $1,834,100 under section 21, Human rights, of the programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995 1/ for the financing of human rights activities in Cambodia. In his report to the Assembly at its forty-ninth session (A/C.5/49/53), the Secretary-General requested the appropriation of $1,834,100 for that purpose.

5. In summary, in his report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session (A/C.5/49/53), the Secretary-General requested an appropriation of $4,473,000 under section 21 of the programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995, representing the level of resources for which commitment authority had initially been extended in respect of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the implementation of the Vienna Plan of Action and the human rights presence in Cambodia.

6. At its forty-ninth session, the General Assembly decided to appropriate, on an exceptional basis, $4,473,000 under section 21 on the understanding that the posts requested by the Secretary-General for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Centre for Human Rights and the human rights presence in Cambodia had been approved on a temporary basis and that all posts would be subject to a detailed review by the Advisory Committee and the Assembly at the earliest opportunity at the resumed forty-ninth session.

7. In section 21 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997, 2/ the Secretary-General requested (a) the establishment of a new P-5 post to strengthen the administrative function of the Centre; (b) the establishment of a new P-3 post to assist the High Commissioner; (c) the conversion of the 21 temporary regular budget posts approved for 1994-1995 to the category of established regular budget posts (including the post of the High Commissioner at the Under-Secretary-General level, four Professional and four General Service posts for the High Commissioner's Office, two Professional and two General Service posts for the implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and eight Professional posts for the Cambodia field office); and (d) the redeployment and downgrading of a D-2 post from executive direction and management to the D-1 level to head the International Instruments Branch of the Centre for Human Rights.

8. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which considered the proposed programme budget of the Secretary-General for the biennium 1996-1997 in August 1995, concluded that with the exception of the Under-Secretary-General post of the High Commissioner, one P-5 and two General Service posts in the Office of the High Commissioner, the decision to convert the remaining 17 temporary posts, approved in 1994-1995, into established posts in 1996-1997 should be deferred until the results of the restructuring of the programme of work of the Centre and identification of priorities was completed. With regard to the proposal for two new established posts in 1996-1997, the Committee did not agree with the establishment of the new P-3 post in the Office of the High Commissioner, but recommended the establishment of the new P-5 post to discharge all the functions of an administrative/executive officer in the Centre.

9. The General Assembly, by its resolution 50/214, taking into account the ongoing process of restructuring of the Centre for Human Rights, decided that the Secretary-General should report by 31 March 1996 to it at its resumed fiftieth session, making proposals on the appropriate level and distribution of resources for the Centre for Human Rights, and endorsed, pending consideration of that report, the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as contained in its first report on the proposed programme budget, as outlined above.

10. The Secretary-General submitted to the General Assembly at its resumed fiftieth session the report requested by it in its resolution 50/214 entitled "Restructuring the Centre for Human Rights" (A/C.5/50/71). Additional information was submitted to the Assembly during its fifty-first session (A/C.5/50/71/Add.1).

11. In its resolution 1996/82 of 24 April 1996, the Commission on Human Rights, taking note of the report of the Secretary-General 3/ supported and encouraged

the efforts of the Secretary-General to enhance the role and further improve the functioning of the Centre for Human Rights, under the overall supervision of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and requested the Secretary-General to make available additional human and financial resources, from within the overall regular budget of the United Nations, and to enhance the capability of the High Commissioner and the Centre to fulfil their mandates effectively.

12. Finally, it is noted that, in the context of achieving the savings mandated by the General Assembly, 12 posts of the Centre for Human Rights (1 D-1, 1 P-5, 3 P-4, 3 P-3 and 4 GS (Other level)) have been frozen until the end of the biennium 1996-1997.

Notes

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 6 (A/48/6/Rev. 1), vol. II.

2/ Ibid., Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 6 (A/50/6/Rev.1), vol. II.

3/ E/CN.4/1996/116.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/642
1 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Agenda items 99 (a) and 111 (e)

# TRAINING AND RESEARCH: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH

# FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH

## Report by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the members of the General Assembly the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Feasibility study on the relocation of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to the Turin Centre" (JIU/REP/96/2).

96-30108 (E) 051196

/...

JIU/REP/96/2

# FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE RELOCATION OF UNITAR TO THE TURIN CENTRE

*Prepared by*

The Joint Inspection Unit

Geneva
1996

CONTENTS


| | Paragraph | Page |
|---|---|---|
| Acronyms | | 5 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | | 6 |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1-6 | 7 |
| II. INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSAL | 7-28 | 8 |
| A. UNITAR | 7-12 | 8 |
| B. The ILO International Training Centre in Turin | 13-18 | 9 |
| C. United Nations Staff College Project | 19-28 | 10 |
| III. THE PROPOSAL FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN UNITAR AND THE UNSCP (INCLUDING POSSIBLE RELOCATION TO TURIN) | 29-37 | 12 |
| IV. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF POTENTIAL RELOCATION OF UNITAR FROM GENEVA TO TURIN | 38-63 | 14 |
| A. Actual and hidden financial costs and savings | 38-52 | 14 |
| B. Non-Financial costs and/or benefits | 53-60 | 17 |
| C. Practical and/or financial advantages and disadvantages for beneficiary countries | 61-63 | 18 |
| VI. Conclusions | 64-66 | 19 |
| NOTES | | 20 |


/...

## Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| **ACC** | Administrative Committee on Coordination |
| **ACABQ** | Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions |
| **CCPOQ** | Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions |
| **ILO** | International Labour Organisation |
| **UNICRI** | United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute |
| **UNITAR** | United Nations Institute for Training and Research |
| **UNOG** | United Nations Office at Geneva |
| **UNSC** | United Nations Staff College |
| **UNSCP** | United Nations Staff College Project |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) is currently located in Geneva, Switzerland. A proposal to move the Institute to the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Turin, Italy, is under consideration.

The objective of this feasibility study is two-fold: (1) to highlight the potential advantages and disadvantages, both financial and non-financial, of either maintaining UNITAR in Geneva or relocating it to Turin; and (2) to assess whether this relocation is compatible with the objective of rationalizing the United Nations system within the framework of the efforts underway, taking into account the financial autonomy of the Institute.

The information and documentation used for the analysis and conclusions were provided by the organizations, institutions and parties concerned (see para. 5). In the course of this study, several issues or questions were identified, which the Unit was unable to address fully, as they were outside the scope of its terms of reference and the established time-frame.

This feasibility study highlights primarily, potential advantages and disadvantages of relocating UNITAR from Geneva to Turin without attempting to determine the relative weight of each and make comparative judgements. In any event, since the relocation of UNITAR from New York to Geneva came as a consequence of a General Assembly decision, it would be useful for all parties concerned to follow the same procedures for any further relocation of UNITAR elsewhere, which would include seeking the approval of the General Assembly.

# I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Board of Trustees of UNITAR requested the Joint Inspection Unit (hereafter referred to as the Unit) to undertake a feasibility study on the relocation of UNITAR from Geneva, Switzerland, to the International Training Centre of the ILO in Turin, Italy, (hereafter referred to as the Turin Centre).

2. As agreed with the UNITAR Board of Trustees, the terms of reference for the study were to examine:

- potential financial costs and savings, both actual and hidden;
- non-financial costs and/or benefits;
- practical and/or financial advantages and disadvantages for countries benefiting from UNITAR training programmes and for those who contribute;
- possible impact on the level of resources received by the Institute; and
- the compatibility with the objective of rationalization of the United Nations system within the framework of the efforts underway, and taking into account the financial autonomy of the Institute.

3. These terms of reference should be viewed in light of the proposal by the Secretary-General for further co-ordination between UNITAR and the United Nations Staff College Project (UNSCP), located at the Turin Centre.

4. At the request of the Board of Trustees, the Unit undertook the commitment to prepare the study in time for the Board's consideration at its September session.

5. To conduct this study, the Unit carried out a series of interviews and enquiries involving members of the Board of Trustees of UNITAR, its Executive Director, representatives of donor countries, representatives of beneficiary and potential beneficiary countries, representatives of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Director of the ILO Turin Centre, the Director of the UNSCP, a representative of the Swiss Government as current host country of UNITAR and a representative of the Government of Italy as potential host country of UNITAR. The Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations was also consulted. In addition, the Unit analysed documentation relating to UNITAR, UNSCP and the Turin Centre.

6. Following its customary procedures, the Unit has gathered views and information and presents its conclusions in an impartial and independent manner, with the objective of clarifying the issues addressed in this study. The Unit conducted this study during June and July, 1996. Given these time constraints, the Unit limited its analysis of the financial implications to the data readily available and was not able to conduct a comparative analysis of long-term potential savings.

## II. INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSAL

### A. UNITAR

7. UNITAR is an autonomous institution within the United Nations framework which was established by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 11 December 1963 pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1934 (XVIII). Its purpose is to enhance "the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving the major objectives of the Organization, by the performance of the functions of . . . training and research."[1] While training and research initially had equal roles, the current emphasis is on training, primarily for representatives of Member States, in the areas of economic and social development and international affairs management. UNITAR also conducts some research projects in support of training activities, as well as a few projects unrelated to training. UNITAR provides training activities to United Nations staff only in more specific subjects.

8. UNITAR is funded by voluntary contributions of Member States, inter-governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations to the General Fund, and earmarked donations to Special Purpose Grants. The Unit was informed that funding from the General Fund was US$843,046 in 1995, and that this funding covered mainly training activities in international affairs management through courses for representatives of Member States at Permanent Missions in New York, Geneva and Vienna. Certain costs relating to core staff and administrative matters are financed also through the General Fund. The Unit also was informed that funding from Special Purpose Grants was $US 3,756,966 in 1995, and that these expenses constitute earmarked funds for specific training programmes. Contributions to the General Fund often have varied considerably, causing financial instability. Additional financial uncertainty for UNITAR results from the fact that the Special Purpose Grants, which include an element of programme support costs related to the administration of the training programmes, also vary considerably by nature.

9. The UNITAR Board of Trustees formulates policies, establishes procedures, reviews and approves the programme of work, and makes recommendations for the effective functioning of the Institute. It consists of representatives of Member States, with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the United Nations General Assembly, the President of the Economic and Social Council and the Executive Director of UNITAR as ex officio members. According to the United Nations Legal Counsel, the Secretary General of the United Nations has overall legal and administrative responsibilities for UNITAR but, "is not responsible for acts done by that Institute."[2]

10. The United Nations Secretary-General may amend the Statute of UNITAR, after consultation with the Board of Trustees, in light of the pertinent decisions of the General Assembly. UNITAR can change its structure in response to changing circumstances without an amendment to its statute or mandate, and has in fact done this to adjust to new activities and changing levels of financial resources. Several studies on the future of UNITAR have been conducted. One major study is the so-called Blanchard report of 1991,[3] prepared at the request of the General Assembly (resolution 45/219). The major points of this report, which are relevant to the present feasibility study, include:

- the need to view any restructuring of UNITAR in the context of the re-examination of all training and research institutes and their association with each other, including joint programme planning and implementation based on the multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral nature of many training activities;
- the shift in focus of UNITAR from a think-tank to a training and research institute that supports training;

- the fact that reliance on Special Purpose Grants can create pressure to undertake activities unrelated to UNITAR's mandate;
- the recommendation to move UNITAR from New York to Geneva to place it in close proximity to appropriate organizations and related centres in Europe, and specifically in Geneva;
- the association of UNITAR with the Turin Centre with regard to establishing the concept of a United Nations staff college;
- the need to incorporate training into the programmes and policies of United Nations organizations; and
- the crucial role of a network of UN-related training institutions, of which the Turin Centre and UNITAR could be the first and essential link.

11. The Board of Trustees approved the recommendations contained in the Blanchard report and the Secretary-General transmitted it to the General Assembly.

12. Due to the financial and credibility crisis faced by UNITAR, and following one specific recommendation of the Blanchard report, the General Assembly decided to transfer UNITAR from New York to Geneva. Thereafter, the Secretary-General appointed an Acting Executive Director of UNITAR. The phasing-out process in New York was completed by 31 December 1993.

## B. THE ILO INTERNATIONAL TRAINING CENTRE IN TURIN

13. The Turin Centre was established in 1963 as the training arm of the ILO. Its mandate is "to provide training activities at the service of economic and social development, in accordance with, and through, the promotion of international labour standards."[4] The target groups that are trained through the Centre comprise United Nations system staff, representatives of Permanent Missions of Member States, national government officials, officials of non-governmental organizations and other individuals, including from the private sector.

14. The Turin Centre may make arrangements with the United Nations, Specialized Agencies and other international organizations to pursue activities in conformity with the objective of the Centre. While the Turin Centre originally carried out mainly ILO-related training activities, over the last five years it has carried out an increasing number of training activities for the United Nations system. As a result, the United Nations System Training Programme section has grown to be one of the largest training components at the Turin Centre.

15. The Centre is an integral part of the ILO and operates under the overall authority of the Governing Body of ILO. The Turin Centre is governed by a separate Statute and Board, whose members are chosen from local, regional and national authorities, non-governmental organizations, several United Nations system organizations and representatives of Member States to the ILO Governing Body. The Centre's Board is chaired by the Director-General of the ILO. While the Statute is based on the Rules and Regulations of the ILO, it maintains a separate set of Rules and Regulations and administrative procedures specifically adapted to the needs and requirements of a training institution. The Director of the Turin Centre is an Assistant Director-General of the ILO, based in Geneva, with its Deputy-Director resident at the Centre.

16. The Centre is financed through a combination of funding sources. In 1996, the overall budget of the Turin Centre was just below US$ 30 million. The ILO provides approximately 10 to 12 percent of the total budget, while earned income provides over 60 percent.[5] This income comes from the implementation of training activities on behalf of other organizations, or through direct fees from sponsored individual participants, consultancy assignments, development of training materials and others. The remaining funding comes from a variety of sources, including local, provincial and national authorities in Italy; governments, intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations; and gifts, grants and legacies.

17. As part of a recent development plan of the Turin Centre, considerable investments have been made in further strengthening the training infrastructure of the Centre. The reproduction and printing facilities are now of such a standard that they can compete commercially, and the use of new technologies, such as video-conferencing, is now an integral part of the activities of the Centre.

18. The Turin Centre hosts other research and training entities of the United Nations system. The Turin Centre will soon be hosting another United Nations institute, the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI). A recent agreement was signed between the United Nations and the ILO for the relocation of UNICRI to the Turin Centre campus and for the use of its facilities and services,[6] but the potential benefits to both institutions are still to be realized.

## C. UNITED NATIONS STAFF COLLEGE PROJECT

19. For the first time in 1971, at the initiative of the Executive Director of UNITAR, who acted with the concurrence of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), the General Assembly considered a proposal for the creation of a staff college and decided to "...approve in principle the idea of the establishment of a United Nations staff college and to defer consideration of the proposal to set up a staff college..." [7] until a more comprehensive examination had been presented. The following year the proposal was further elaborated, but the General Assembly decided again to defer a decision on the matter. Finally, in 1973, upon the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), the General Assembly abandoned this proposal and it was left to UNITAR to launch some initial activities in inter-agency training.

20. Since then, the concept of a staff college has been mentioned repeatedly, in the context of providing the staff of the organizations with the skills, knowledge and techniques required for responding efficiently and effectively to the needs of the Member States. One of the primary reasons why it has remained a proposal rather than a reality is the difficulty of ensuring the necessary common commitment, financial and otherwise, from both Member States and the organizations of the United Nations system to the creation of yet another institution. In addition, there is concern regarding how to ensure that such an initiative operates in the appropriate institutional framework to fulfil its mandate.

21. There remains an overall need to use training as a fundamental tool for instilling in the United Nations system staff the necessary "management culture," thereby facilitating United Nations reforms, which include streamlining, consolidating and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations system.

22. In this connection the Secretary-General officially announced the creation of the UNSCP on 8 January 1996. According to one representative of the Secretary-General, the UNSCP is based on an in-depth feasibility study conducted in 1995 by a group of senior experts.

23. The UNSCP is currently located at the Turin Centre in Italy, to support training initiatives for both United Nations system staff and United Nations partners, as part of the process of creating a new management culture. Many of the on-going training activities of the Centre, which, according to one representative of the Secretary-General, are carried out in direct response to various General Assembly resolutions on operational activities, General Assembly Resolution 47/199 in particular, and at the request of the inter-Agency Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational questions (CCPOQ), will be integrated into the UNSCP framework. In addition, the UNSCP will be developing and delivering new joint activities and acting as the support structure of the network.

24. The basic objective of the UNSCP is to design and deliver system-wide training for both United Nations staff and national partners in order to: (1) strengthen management capacities and to promote a more cohesive management culture; and (2) build more effective cross-programme linkages and support cross-sectoral integration in the major areas of activity of the United Nations. Thus, rather than duplicating existing training activities, the declared aim of the UNSCP is to supplement and expand training in areas of common concern and also to pool resources and share experiences as appropriate.

25. An essential part of the concept of the UNSCP is to be flexible and responsive, and to develop training activities in response to clearly identified needs. As a means to ensure this responsiveness and demand-driven approach, the UNSCP is financed entirely by contributions to specific training initiatives. Furthermore, as the UNSCP is to some extent charting new ground, experience would indicate the most appropriate institutional framework for performing its mandate in the future, and toward this end, an assessment and evaluation of the project after its initial 5-year period, would appear appropriate.

26. The UNSCP is financed from many sources including voluntary contributions of individual Member States, contributions by United Nations and other organizations, revenues from its activities, and contributions from foundations and civic society, as appropriate, for specific training initiatives within its mandate. Since the UNSCP is conceived as a system-wide training network, the support of United Nations system organizations would be essential. Several organizations already have provided contributions in kind through the secondment of senior-level experts to the core management unit of the UNSCP.

27. An Advisory Panel, approved by the Secretary-General and chaired by a senior panel member, would have overall responsibility for developing substantive guidance for the UNSCP. The members of the Advisory Panel would be eminent persons in the training and substantive technical fields both from within and outside the United Nations system. Currently, the core management unit of the UNSCP manages jointly developed activities and acts as the support structure for the network. According to the Secretary-General, the Turin Centre was selected as the site of the UNSCP because it is the only residential training institution in the United Nations system and because it has considerable institutional experience and knowledge in managing training programmes, an established network with other training institutions and an established administrative infrastructure. In addition, the Turin Centre already has a programme, in support of the United Nations system as a whole, that has delivered training since 1990.

28. The Unit was informed that the United Nations Staff College, if approved by the General Assembly, would have a separate identity, operate on a full cost-recovering basis and be charged for administrative costs and overhead by the Turin Centre.

## III. THE PROPOSAL FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN UNITAR AND THE UNSCP (INCLUDING POSSIBLE RELOCATION TO TURIN)

29. The Secretary-General's initiative calls for much closer cooperation between UNITAR and UNSCP. This is rooted in trends within the United Nations system to restructure the secretariats and the intergovernmental machinery in order to consolidate functions, programmes and activities and thereby avoid duplication and overlap, as well as to discontinue obsolete, marginal and/or terminated activities, thus, achieving savings and improving the performance, efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations system.

30. A number of resolutions emanating from the governing bodies of various United Nations organizations in support of greater coherence and effectiveness of training within the United Nations system, have stressed the need for innovative and integrated system-wide training programmes and activities designed for both international and national staff. General Assembly resolution 47/199 (paras., 43 to 47) is especially relevant to the Secretary-General's initiative.

31. Several reviews to assess the training institutions and activities within the United Nations system in order to propose concrete, practical measures to improve coordination have been requested or proposed, the most recent request being made by the General Assembly in resolution 47/227 of 4 May 1993. In most cases, however, such reviews were not conducted.[8]

32. General Assembly resolution 47/227 regarding UNITAR, which included the decision to transfer UNITAR from New York to Geneva, explicitly requested the United Nations Secretary-General to further explore closer co-operation between UNITAR and other qualified national and international training institutions, including the Turin Centre. The potential for cooperation takes on new dimensions with the recent initiative of the UNSCP.

33. UNITAR and United Nations officials, including the Director of UNSCP, have held discussions regarding the initiative of the Secretary-General where they have identified two areas of joint activity, preventive diplomacy and peace-making, but concrete results have not yet been realized.

34. The Unit was informed that, as part of this exchange, the Executive Director of UNITAR was requested ". . . to prepare for the Board and for the Secretary-General: (a) a proposal for programme collaboration between the United Nations Staff College and UNITAR; and (b) a draft timetable for whatever physical association with the UNSC in Turin is feasible before the end of this year."[9]

35. The Board of Trustees has discussed the question several times and at its thirty fourth session, held in Geneva from 30 April to 2 May 1996, considered ". . . the explicit interest of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the transfer of UNITAR to Turin, as expressed in the speech read on his behalf by the Director-General of UNOG. . . ."[10] The representative of the Secretary-General to the Board stated that ". . . the Secretary-General has indicated that a move of UNITAR to Turin would appear desirable as it would regroup in one main location two major providers of training activities in the United Nations system" which is one of the factors that led "the Secretary-General to believe that it is in everyone's best interest to consider favourably such an arrangement." (Emphasis added.)

36. The extent to which this implies a total physical relocation can be argued, but it should be clear that it is a proposal for consideration by the Board of Trustees. As the supreme legislative authority in this field, the General Assembly would take the final decision.

37. The process of developing and reviewing the proposal certainly has been subject to misgivings and misinterpretations. Nevertheless, all interviewees, without exception, supported and stressed the need for better coordination and called for a long-standing, comprehensive arrangement among the various United Nations system institutions dealing with training.

## IV. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF POTENTIAL RELOCATION OF UNITAR FROM GENEVA TO TURIN

### A. ACTUAL AND HIDDEN FINANCIAL COSTS AND SAVINGS

38. Table I below shows the estimated annual savings that would be achieved if UNITAR, with its current staffing levels, were relocated to Turin, based on data provided by the United Nations Secretariat. These savings estimates are based on fixed costs, which are defined as the cost of UNITAR facilities operations and maintenance and staff covered by the General Fund and the Special Purpose Grants. Estimated cost savings of approximately $US400,000 represent mainly the difference in the post adjustment levels between Geneva and Turin.

39. The assumption made by the United Nations Secretariat in these figures is that the number of staff would remain the same in Turin as it is currently in Geneva, which represents 11 Professional and 4 General Service level staff.

**Table I.**

| *Location* | *Recurrent Costs* ($US)* | | *Totals ($US)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Staff* | *Rent/Common Services* | |
| Geneva | $1,750,000 | $78,000 | $1,828,000 |
| Turin | $1,350,000 | $60,000 | $1,410,000 |
| ***Total yearly savings*** | **$400,000** | **$18,000** | $418,000 |

**Includes staff costs and rent/common services covered through the General Fund and Special Purpose Grants.*
Source: United Nations Secretariat

40. The Unit was informed that the Swiss authorities provide to the United Nations the building UNITAR now occupies in Geneva at no cost, while the United Nations charges UNITAR approximately $US 78,000 per year for rent. The General Assembly and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions have called upon the Secretary-General to take action to remedy this anomaly. According to the United Nations Secretariat, the $78,000 charged as rent, represents charges for rent/common services.

41. The Unit was informed that if UNITAR is relocated to Turin, it would enjoy free-of-charge premises, but would be charged $US 50,000 to $US 60,000 per year for common services at the Turin Centre. Table I has taken into account the highest possible cost of common services, according to the information given (US$60,000), resulting in an estimated cost savings of $US18,000 for rent/common services.

42. According to the figures provided by the United Nations Secretariat, the premises UNITAR plans to occupy in the Turin Centre would require approximately $US300,000 for refurbishing (non-recurrent cost), which the Italian authorities have indicated they would finance. In addition, non-recurrent costs of the removal would amount to approximately $US300,000 which would be offset by the estimated $US 418,000 in recurring saving to be achieved in the first year, resulting in a net saving of $US 118,000 in the first year. This assumes funds for the removal costs will be available at the time of removal.

43. The Swiss authorities have informed the Unit that they plan to demolish the building where UNITAR is presently located. The Unit received assurances that if UNITAR were to remain in Geneva, it would be relocated in the near future to a more modern building, and the Swiss Government would provide it at "favourable conditions" to UNITAR. It would be useful for the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNITAR to clarify with the Swiss authorities what these "favourable conditions" represent in order to better understand the cost-savings implications of a relocation of UNITAR to Turin.

44. Table II incorporates other figures that were given by UNITAR. These figures only cover costs financed by the General Fund. UNITAR's cost estimates for 1997, financed through General Fund resources, are $450,000 for staff in Geneva and $330,000 for staff in Turin.

45. According to UNITAR, other cost estimates that are covered through the General Fund include the costs for common services. In Turin, these costs are estimated at $60,000 and in Geneva, UNITAR assumed the new building would be provided to UNITAR, once the old one is demolished, at no cost. Costs covered by the Special Purpose Grants have not been included due to their variable nature and, therefore their unpredictability.

## Table II.

| *Location* | *Recurrent Costs ($US)** | | *Totals ($US)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Staff* | *Rent/Common Services* | |
| Geneva | $450,000 | - | $450,000 |
| Turin | $330,000 | $60,000 | $390,000 |
| ***Total yearly savings*** | **$120,000** | **($60,000)** | **$60,000** |

** Includes staff costs and rent/common services covered through the General Fund only.*

Source: UNITAR

46. If both tables and the underlying assumptions by which the figures have been derived are taken into account, the Unit can only conclude that according to the data provided, potential savings are expected to accrue in a transfer of UNITAR from Geneva to Turin.

47. The above savings estimates relate to the fixed costs of staff, common services and rent. A more complete picture of the potential financial savings could be provided by analysing the potential variable cost savings if the current level of UNITAR activities had been carried out with UNITAR located in Turin. These variable costs are financed primarily by Special Purpose Grants, which are directly associated with the level of activities. The relocation to Turin may affect the variable costs, which would include, for example, the cost

of UNITAR staff travel to training locations, communications, and consultants working in Turin rather than in Geneva. These variable costs do not include travel of participants.

48. Assuming that the level of activities, which is not fully reflected in Table I, remains the same if UNITAR is relocated to Turin, including the duration and location of training, cost projections could have been calculated, using current Turin costs as a base. However, these data were not readily available and given the time constraints of this study, such an analysis was not possible.[11]

49. In comparing the difference in cost between different locations, different assumptions were made by UNOG and UNITAR regarding levels of financing. In the case of fixed costs, the Unit assumed the General Fund would remain at least at the current level. However, all the donors interviewed expressed the view that while they are satisfied with the current performance of UNITAR, which has gained the confidence of both donors and recipients after completing its relocation to Geneva, a move to Turin would create a situation of uncertainty.

50. All donors explained that they would need to reassess their level and policy of contribution in the light of the performance of UNITAR in the new environment in Turin. The availability of other potential donors to compensate for a potential shortage of funds is not assured. Therefore, UNITAR could face a shortfall until it re-establishes its funding base.

51. In the case of the Special Purpose Grants, a representative of an important donor to these grants has indicated it is attractive to co-operate with UNITAR for organizing certain training and research, primarily due to its location in Geneva. The donor probably would look for other partners if UNITAR is relocated.

52. Many interviewees stressed the importance of UNITAR's proximity to other organizations located in Geneva and how this facilitates organizing specialized training programmes at low cost.

## B. NON-FINANCIAL COSTS AND/OR BENEFITS

### Non-financial advantages of relocating UNITAR from Geneva to Turin

53. The question of co-ordination between UNITAR and the UNSCP as two important training institutions of the United Nations is crucial to the discussion of closer cooperation. Some interviewees pointed out that if UNITAR is located in Turin, it would be able to better co-ordinate and interact with the UNSCP, the Turin Centre and UNICRI. The potential impact of the combined work and better utilization of services provided by the Turin Centre would be a significant benefit.

54. The synergy at the substantive and technical level between professionals in training, resulting from the interaction between UNITAR and the other institutions currently located at Turin Centre, would also facilitate sharing of ideas, expertise and methodologies of training, including pooling of resources in new training technologies.

55. Some interviewees emphasized that, as the only residential training facility in the United Nations system, the Turin Centre has the image and credibility of being an entity dedicated to meeting training needs. Although the Turin Centre operates under ILO overall administration, many United Nations system-wide training activities are carried out at or through the Turin Centre free of substantive interference. The Turin Centre is often used as a venue for workshops, conferences and meetings of United Nations system and others interested in United Nations matters, and therefore provides a good opportunity for intellectual and professional exchange.[12]

56. Training being its sole purpose, the Turin Centre is continuously working to ensure that its organizational structure, common services and facilities, and rules and procedures are geared to training activities. The Centre also attracts voluntary contributions and earmarked funds, and has the necessary flexibility to respond to the training needs of its various constituencies. Therefore, any institutions located there could benefit from this feature.

### Non-financial disadvantages of relocating UNITAR from Geneva to Turin

57. Many interviewees fear that locating UNITAR in Turin would isolate it from the United Nations system organizations and other institutions, both public and private, located in Geneva, with which UNITAR works closely. The main argument is that direct and personal contacts and interaction between UNITAR and its associates are crucial for mobilizing resources and organizing training activities.

58. According to several interviewees, the fact that the Director of Turin Centre is based in Geneva raises doubts that relocation to Turin would lead to a better coordination between UNITAR and other institutions.

59. The legal arrangements involved in the transfer of UNITAR, in particular regarding its staff, have not been concluded. According to the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, "Concerning especially the need for a host country agreement with Italy in case of relocation of UNITAR, we note that there are several precedents of such agreements having being negotiated and concluded, including as a result of the relocation of United Nations bodies, and do not anticipate that a headquarters agreement would pose in this case any inordinate difficulty."[13] Further, the Unit was informed that unless the General Assembly decides otherwise, any relocation of UNITAR to a different duty-station, should not affect either the Statute of UNITAR or the status of the personnel, except to the extent that local conditions warrant.[14] Since a country agreement with Italy would have to be negotiated, the potential

benefits and/or disadvantages of such an agreement with Italy compared to the current agreement with Switzerland cannot be considered.

60. The physical relocation of UNITAR to Turin, also could involve the loss of experienced key staff who might not be in a position to transfer to Turin for personal reasons. Most of UNITAR's staff work under short-term contracts and it is highly likely that they would not accept being transferred elsewhere under those unstable contractual conditions.

## C. PRACTICAL AND/OR FINANCIAL ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES FOR BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES

### Advantages of relocating UNITAR from Geneva to Turin

61. While the financial costs and time involved in sending participants to training activities in Turin is an important consideration, there are also qualitative gains from having participants away from the pressures of daily business, interruptions, and pressing appointments, which often mean missing part of the training.

### Disadvantages of relocating UNITAR from Geneva to Turin

62. Most interviewees expressed major concern with the issue of the financial costs and time involved in sending participants to training activities in Turin. Since developing countries are the major beneficiaries of the training provided by UNITAR, the fear was that if UNITAR is transferred to Turin, they would face financial and practical difficulties in sending their officials and diplomats there. One representative of the Secretary-General pointed out that the main idea is to transfer the core co-ordination functions to Turin, while the actual training for representatives of permanent missions and governmental officials from capitals would remain in Geneva, New York and Vienna, or wherever it would be most appropriate. Staff and trainers would travel from Turin whenever necessary. Another representative of the Secretary-General pointed out that if participants or trainees would have to travel, funding might be available from the United Nations to send representatives of permanent missions of the developing countries from Geneva to Turin for training.

63. The extent to which there would be a need for a presence through a liaison office or "an antenna" in main duty stations has not been addressed. The financial and practical implications of establishing some offices are unclear.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

64. There is a general consensus on the need to find concrete and implementable ways to co-ordinate the United Nations system training activities in order to use resources more rationally, avoid duplication and overlap, and consolidate activities to the extent possible. There also appears to be general agreement to tackle this question in a comprehensive manner and not to follow a piecemeal approach. The Secretary-General's efforts to find a comprehensive and lasting solution for a better coordination and a potential regrouping of the United Nations system training activities is a key element in this regard. Therefore, the United Nations Staff College Project (UNSCP) should be regarded as part of those efforts.

65. As has been shown above, there are many aspects and issues to consider in assessing the nature, degree and characteristics of closer cooperation between UNITAR and the UNSCP as training entities within the United Nations system. Many of these issues are not particular to the relationship between UNITAR and the UNSCP, but relate to the overall concept, strategy and policy of training in the United Nations system. The UNSCP is a new venture, which could make a contribution. However, the exact nature of that contribution and how it relates to other training elements, can only emerge with experience and further development. In the meantime, UNITAR should continue strengthening its cooperation with the UNSCP through practical and concrete measures, in order to take advantage of U-NITAR's long-standing experience and expertise in training.

66. Pending further elaboration through experience of the UNSCP concept, and as a critical input into the ongoing thinking on regrouping and networking training institutions and activities within the United Nations system, the General Assembly may wish to receive for its consider-ation a comprehensive study of the training institutions and activities within the United Nations system. This review would take stock of all institutions providing training and propose practical, concrete measures to co-ordinate these activities.

## NOTES

1. UNITAR Statute, article I, 1990.

2. Letter of the United Nations Legal Counsel to the Executive Director of UNITAR of 15 May 1996.

3. Training and Research: United Nations Institute for Training and Research. Note by the Secretary-General (A/46/482 of 30 September 1991).

4. Statute of International Training Centre of the ILO, Article I as modified by the Governing Body of the ILO at its 249th session (February-March 1991, GB.249/250).

5. Programme and Budget of ILO International Training Centre for 1995 and 1996.

6. Agreement between the United Nations and the International Labour Organization (ILO) regarding the use and occupation of the premises at the International Training Centre of the ILO in Turin and the facilities and services thereof by the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute, 17 May 1996.

7. General Assembly decision of 21 December 1971 (GAOR, 26th session, Agenda item 84, Personnel Questions, Document A/8604, paragraphs 10-18).

8. The Unit has not been able to locate any of these requested or proposed studies and/or reports. UNITAR also has informed the Unit that as far as it is aware, these studies and/or reports are not available.

9. Correspondence of 29 March 1996 between representative of Secretary General and Executive Director of UNITAR

10. Conclusions and recommendations of the Special session of the Board of Trustees of UNITAR held at Geneva from 30 April to 2 May 1996.

11. UNITAR officials confirmed that such analysis could be done, but that the information would be contained within the files and records of programme officers, and would not be available as part of the financial management system. Given the time constraints it was suggested by UNITAR that it, at best, would be very unrealistic to perform such analysis.

12. For instance, recently the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS), a body of scholars, professionals and others interested in research and studies on the United Nations system, held its annual conference in Turin.

13. Comments provided by Mr. Ralph Zacklin, Director and Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General in charge of the Office of Legal Affairs, dated 25 July 1996.

14. As an example, the agreement regarding the transfer of UNICRI (see note above) does not deal with the question of staff at all, but confines itself to the premises and other common facilities.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/642/Add.1
6 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Agenda items 99 (a) and 111 (e)

# TRAINING AND RESEARCH: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH

# FINANCIAL REPORTS AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND REPORTS OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Note by the Secretary-General

Addendum

The Secretary-General has the honour to submit to the General Assembly his comments on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Feasibility study on the relocation of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research to the Turin Centre" (A/51/642).

## I. GENERAL

1. The Secretary-General fully shares the conclusion of the report that there is a general consensus on the need to find concrete and implementable ways to coordinate United Nations system training activities in order to use resources more rationally, avoid duplication and overlap, and consolidate activities to the extent possible, as well as on the need to tackle this question in a comprehensive manner.

2. The Secretary-General has consistently expressed his strong support for United Nations system-wide training and the role it could play in better preparing staff to face the multidimensional challenges before the Organization. At a time when the United Nations system is faced with increasingly complex and diverse mandates, often requiring an inter-agency and cross-sectoral approach, there is a need to enhance possibilities for integrated cost-effective training in areas of system-wide concern. The Secretary-General considers that a Staff College, with a curriculum to be developed in consultation with the

organizations of the system, has significant potential, not only to enhance substantive knowledge and technical skills, but also to convey a system-wide vision of goals, strategies and opportunities for coordinated action. A Staff College would not duplicate, but complement the capabilities of organizations of the system by offering multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral training with a system-wide perspective. While the primary users of the Staff College will be the organizations of the United Nations system, the College will also open its activities to selected governmental and non-governmental personnel who are partners in United Nations system activities. Consideration will be given to associating the private sector with selected activities of the College.

3. The Staff College is conceived initially as a United Nations project, financed from extrabudgetary resources, under the overall guidance of the Secretary-General, with an initial time-frame of five years. The project is based on an in-depth feasibility study conducted by a group of senior experts in 1995 which confirmed the need, and system-wide support, for the Secretary-General's initiative. It is not conceived as a single institution, but rather as a global network of training centres and academic and professional institutions. The hub of the network is a small management team located in the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization at Turin, which also serves as one of the training locations within the network. The implementation of the project has been entrusted to the International Training Centre to benefit from the Centre's existing institutional capacity and build on its recognized training environment, experience and infrastructure. This network approach will allow the College to make the best use of all kinds of training and research experience both within and outside the system.

4. In this context, the Secretary-General considers that there is a natural partnership between the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the Staff College which can engender mutually beneficial cooperation in terms of curriculum development in the many areas and disciplines of shared interest to their respective target programme participants. It can enhance the cost-effectiveness of programme development and delivery. In this connection, the Secretary-General notes that both UNITAR and Staff College activities are financed in their entirety through extrabudgetary resources. Enhanced coordination will thus help address the issue of "donor fatigue" when approaching contributing governmental and non-governmental organizations. Joint training and learning opportunities for government representatives and United Nations system staff in areas of common interest can only contribute to enhancing overall operational effectiveness and responsiveness. In strengthening its linkages with the Staff College project, UNITAR would also be responding to the request by the General Assembly in its resolution 50/121 that it further develop its cooperation with United Nations institutes and other national, regional and international institutes.

5. Accordingly, the Secretary-General shares the conclusion in paragraph 65 of the report that UNITAR should continue to strengthen its cooperation with the United Nations Staff College Project through practical and concrete measures. UNITAR has already made a valuable contribution to Staff College curriculum development workshops. Areas identified for further cooperation include

peacekeeping and peacemaking; the provision of humanitarian assistance and management of complex emergencies; and the management of development activities.

6. As indicated in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the implementation of his strategy for the management of the Organization's human resources (A/C.5/51/1), Staff College activities should also be geared to facilitating standard-setting and networking throughout the system and encourage a more broadly shared management culture. As such, the Staff College may be viewed as an important component of the Secretary-General's approach to reform.

7. Should the General Assembly so wish, the Secretary-General will pursue further the proposal of the Joint Inspection Unit that a comprehensive study of the training institutions and activities within the United Nations system be conducted. It should be noted, in this connection, that training in the United Nations system remains on the agenda of the Administrative Committee on Coordination Subcommittee on Training and the Consultative Committee on Programme and Operational Questions Panel on Training. As indicated by the Joint Inspection Unit in paragraph 64 of its report, the United Nations Staff College Project should be regarded as an important part of the Secretary-General's continuing efforts to find a comprehensive and lasting solution for the better coordination of the United Nations system training activities.

## II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Joint United Nations Institute for Training and Research/International Labour Organization Task Force (para. 32)

8. It should be recalled that in 1993, a Joint UNITAR/ILO Task Force was created to study the issue of relocation of UNITAR to Turin. However, the report of the Joint Inspection Unit does not make any reference to this initiative or to conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force.

Cost of premises (paras. 40-45 and table II)

9. It should be noted that the amount of $78,000 per year charged to UNITAR represents only a portion of the total costs incurred by the United Nations for the maintenance and utilities of the UNITAR premises at Geneva. There is no basis to assume that the relocation of UNITAR to a new building, which may be provided to it by the Swiss Government, would be at no cost. Furthermore, the costs for rent/common services at Geneva shown in table II do not correspond to the reality, because even if the new building were to be provided to UNITAR at no cost, UNITAR would still need to incur expenditures for the maintenance of the building and for the use of utilities.

Benefits and disadvantages of the relocation

10. The only concrete data provided in the report's tables point to the conclusion that the relocation would lead to significant savings, whereas disadvantages of the move, particularly those discussed in paragraphs 49 to 51, appear to be entirely hypothetical. It would have been helpful if the Joint

Inspection Unit had provided more detailed and specific information in support of those observations.

11. Concerning the argument in paragraph 57 of the report that UNITAR would be isolated in Turin, it seems that the Joint Inspection Unit did not take into account the impact of modern communications and the fact that the Turin Centre conducts worldwide training activities without any difficulties. Rather than leading to isolation, the Turin Centre provides the facilities and environment conducive to intensive and effective training.

Funding for travel of diplomats to Turin (para. 62)

12. It is not clear in what capacity a Joint Inspection Unit interlocutor made a statement that "if participants or trainees would have to travel, funding might be available from the United Nations to send representatives of permanent missions of the developing countries from Geneva to Turin for training", which is attributed in the report to a representative of a Secretary-General. It should be noted that there are no provisions in the United Nations Financial Regulations and Rules or in General Assembly resolutions for funding training costs of representatives of permanent missions at Turin or any other location.

---